### London Borough of Islington

## Planning Committee - 6 February 2018

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held at Council Chamber, Town Hall, Upper Street, N1 2UD on 6 February 2018 at 7.30 pm.

**Present:** Councillors: Khan (Chair), Nicholls, Fletcher and Kay

#### Councillor Robert Khan in the Chair

## 358 INTRODUCTIONS (Item A1)

Councillor Khan welcomed everyone to the meeting. Members of the Committee and officers introduced themselves and the Chair outlined the procedures for the meeting.

# 359 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE (Item A2)

Apologies were received from Councillors Donovan-Hart, Picknell, Court, Convery, Gantly and Ward.

## 360 DECLARATIONS OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (Item A3)

There were no declarations of substitute members.

## 361 <u>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item A4)</u>

There were no declarations of interest.

## 362 ORDER OF BUSINESS (Item A5)

The order of business would be B4,B1,B2 and B3.

## 363 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item A6)

## **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2018 be confirmed as an accurate record of proceedings and the Chair be authorised to sign them.

# 364 <u>202-210 FAIRBRIDGE ROAD, LONDON, N19 3HT (Item B1)</u>

Demolition of existing MOT garage (Use Class B2) and the erection of a 5 storey building to provide 2no. commercial units (Use Class B1/B8) at ground floor, 15

residential units above (4x1 beds, 11x2 beds, Use Class C3), with cycle parking, refuse storage, plant, landscaping, and associated engineering works.

(Planning application number: P2017/2754/FUL)

- The Planning Officer advised Members that no representations had been received since the papers were published and that Network Rail had withdrawn their previous objections.
- The Planning officer provided a number of updates to reflect corrections -: Condition 2 (drawing numbers), Condition 5 (omitting the reference to PV panels) and Condition 13 (omitting the reference to a basement). Also Members were advised that the opening hours referred to in condition 11 were correct, and p38/ paragraph 10.104 of the report should be updated to reflect condition 11.
- With regards to the provision of affordable housing, Members were advised that a
  financial viability assessment had been submitted by the applicant which had had
  been independently appraised, and that that the scheme could viably provide 5
  shared ownership units and a residual surplus of £42,000.
- The objector was concerned that the proposal would impact his amenity and quality of life, as his own house would be sandwiched between the scheme and another proposal seeking permission. The case officer advised that the other proposal (469 Hornsey Road) was acknowledged in the committee report, does not currently have planning permission, and that the objector's concerns would only be realised if both schemes were granted planning permission. Therefore the current application should be assessed on its own merits, and if permission is granted, the cumulative impacts of any future decisions will need to be assessed when those decisions are made.
- The objector was concerned with overlooking and privacy due to the height of the building and suggested a more solid screening to address their concerns.
- The agent in response informed Members that the scheme before the Committee
  was as a result of the advice received from both the design review panel and council
  officers and that issues of overlooking and loss of privacy had been addressed by
  ensuring that the living rooms were sited in the rear elevation of the site and privacy
  screens would be included.
- The agent advised that the scheme had been designed to minimise the impact of overlooking. With regards to noise pollution during construction, this will be managed by a construction management plan. He reiterated the benefits of the scheme.
- A suggestion to amend condition 15 to refer to the privacy screens being solid and fixed in place was agreed.
- The committee resolved to approve the application subject to condition 15 (privacy screens) being amended to refer to the privacy screens being solid and fixed in place.

Councillor Fletcher proposed a motion to amend condition 15 as stated above. This was seconded by Councillor Nicholls and carried.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report plus the amendments set out above and within the report and the additional condition outlined above; and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1.

# 365 9-12 GREAT SUTTON STREET, LONDON, EC1V 0BX (Item B2)

Demolition of existing building and construction of a part two, part six-storey mixed use building providing 1,802m2 of B1(a) office floorspace over basement, ground, first and second floors and 10 residential flats (three x 1-bedroom, six x 2-bedroom, one x 3-bedroom) above.

(Planning application number: P2016/4533/FUL)

- The Planning Officer informed Members that item was deferred at the meeting of the Committee on 18 July 2017 for three reasons which the applicant had now addressed. Members were advised that the applicant had submitted responses from the Design Review Panel (DRP), an amended daylight sunlight report and a Fire Strategy.
- The meeting was informed that 2 letters of objection had been received, one from a
  resident who is registered to speak and 2 letters from local Member of Parliament
  raising issues of overlooking, privacy, daylight/sunlight and light pollution. The local
  MP has requested if further amendments could be made to overcome overlooking
  issue.
- Members were informed that feedback from DRP was positive and they were impressed with the quality of the materials proposed especially with the special bricks. Also Members were advised that applicant had received a letter from the fire authority confirming their satisfaction with the proposals safety strategy.
- With regards to the impact of the daylight loss, the Planning Officer advised that fewer windows actually failed the test as compared to the original officer assessment in the July report and that the applicant had visited 5 neighbouring flats to confirm the room sizes and layouts and submitted an amended daylight/sunlight assessment.
- Objections raised by neighbouring residents included concerns regarding overlooking, the scale of the scheme, whether the new case officer been passed the previous letters of objection, whether the windows were numbered correctly in the amended daylight/sunlight report and that officers had not visited their apartments to assess the impact of the proposal on resident's amenity.

- In response the applicant's agent informed Members that the proposal would provide a higher quality, more accessible and more employment space than the existing buildings currently offered. They clarified the addresses of the flats that had been visited and the window numbering in the daylight/sunlight report
- Members were concerned about the level of overlooking from the offices to nearby residents and Cllr Fletcher proposed a motion to amend condition 9 to alleviate the privacy concerns by providing obscure glazing to all south facing windows to the rear elevation. This was seconded by Councillor Khan and carried.
- Members were concerned about the hours of use of the terrace and potential noise
  pollution concerns arising from the use of the roof terraces and Cllr Kay proposed a
  motion to limit the hours of its use from 09:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday. This was
  seconded by Councillor Nicholls and carried.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions and informatives set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and the amended conditions and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report.

## 366 PAUL ANTHONY HOUSE, 724 HOLLOWAY ROAD, LONDON, N19 3JD (Item B3)

Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a 6-storey (plus basement) building accommodating 1,307sqm (NIA) office floorspace at basement and first to fifth floors, and a 243sqm (NIA) retail (A1 use) unit at ground level, together with associated cycle parking and refuse and recycling storage.

(Planning application number: P2016/3353/FUL)

- The Planning Officer advised Members that at paragraph 10.163 of the report, the Head of Terms should include the payment of a figure of £350,000 for the provision of affordable housing within the Borough.
- Members were advised that the site is located within Archway Town Centre and that the proposal would result in a substantial increase in office floorspace, inclusive of SME workspace together with 10 new residential units
- In response to sunlight/daylight, outlook and privacy, Members were informed that conditions have been recommended to ensure that there would not be any significant impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers.
- The Planning Officer informed Members that although there is a reference to additional excavation in paragraph 10.25 for providing an increased basement, this would not take place on Network Rail land which is not within the site.

Members welcomed the scheme as policy compliant.

## RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1.

# 367 <u>SITE OF ELECTRICITY SUB STATION, OPPOSITE 15-27 GEE STREET & CAR PARK SPACES 90-98 GOSWELL ROAD (Item B4)</u>

Demolition of existing boundary walls and brick substation enclosure and erection of a seven storey building to provide 3,956 sqm (GIA) office (Use Class B1a) floorspace on part ground floor and Levels 1-6 and 94 sqm (GIA) retail floorspace on part ground floor.

(Planning application number: P2017/3389/FUL)

- The Planning Officer advised Members that item was deferred at the 5 December meeting to allow the applicant consider a more permanent solution to the overlooking concerns and loss of privacy. Members were informed that the applicant had identified 3 dwellings which could be most directly overlooked.
- Members were informed that the applicant had proposed internal louvres to mitigate
  overlooking of residential units within The Rooftops. Members were informed that in
  the case where residential windows were directly opposite the office floorplate the
  louvres would be rotated to block out the view, and where the views are oblique the
  louvres would be oriented to allow straight views out whilst screening angled ones.
- The Planning Officer advised that a further objection had been received with accompanying photographs to demonstrate the likely reflection of activity within flats within the Rooftops onto the glazed façade of the proposed building. The Planning Officer presented the photographs to the committee.
- Members were informed of a further objection had been received raising concerns
  that overlooking and reflection onto the façade of the proposed building may have
  safety and security implications for residents, and also raising concerns in relation to
  light pollution.
- The Planning Officer advised that residents of The Rooftops had requested that the
  recommended condition at paragraph 2.22 of the committee report be amended to
  require consultation with residents of the block on the details of measures to mitigate
  light pollution.
- Neighbouring residents were concerned about overlooking and loss of privacy as
  they were surrounded by similar type of buildings and that conditions regarding the
  light reflections were not sufficient and that it would be important that neighbouring
  residents be consulted regarding the appropriate measures to alleviate light pollution
  concerns as previous schemes that had similar conditions were not fulfilled after

changes in tenancies.

- The Agent advised Committee that the applicant had worked in conjunction with the Design Review Panel to address the overlooking concerns. The agent reminded Committee that Gee street was a public highway; the proposal being an office development facing residential so there was no policy issue of overlooking.
- Councillor Fletcher enquired on whether further commitments to within the condition to secure a management plan for light pollution mitigation measures which should address tenant arrangements and leases.
- It was suggested that an additional condition be recommended to secure and permanently maintain the overlooking mitigation measures detailed within the Internal Views Report submitted by the applicant.
- Planning Officer informed the Committee that condition 2 (plan numbers) would be revised to reflect a couple of corrections to plan documents and plan numbers and also conditions 9 (energy efficiency) and conditions 10 (renewable energy) will be amended to reflect the Council's Energy Advisor's previous comments that the applicant should attempt to achieve further improvements in relation to renewable energy and co2 reduction.
- Members agreed that an expectation of nil overlooking in a densely built up are would be unrealistic but welcomed the measures that the applicants had proposed in order to alleviate overlooking concerns.

Councillor Fetcher proposed a motion to include an additional condition, the exact wording to be delegated to Officers ensuring that residents are consulted on measures to mitigate light pollution. This was seconded by Councillor Kay and carried.

#### **RESOLVED:**

That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions of the officer report plus the amendments above and the additional condition outlined above; and subject to the prior completion of a Deed of Planning Obligation made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 securing the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1 of the officer report as amended above, the wording of which was delegated to officers

The meeting e	nded at 9.	15 pm
---------------	------------	-------

CHAIR